

#10
nrlw
OFFICIAL

FAX RECEIVED

JAN 24 2003

GROUP 3600



Med-DATA Net™ LLC

PO Box 23 - North Branford CT 06471
Telephone 203 / 288-1588 - Fax 203 / 288-1589 - Email info@meddatanet.com

Examiner Alexander Kalinowski
US Patent Office
Art Unit 3626
Washington, DC. Fax- 703-305-7687

FAXED
1/23/03

⑥ pages

RE: William Reeves - application 09/583,336

Dear Mr. Kalinowski,

1/23/03

You telephone call the other day was extremely upsetting to me regarding this application. I would like to bring to your attention the following:

1. I mailed in my request for extension and check on about 11/17/02 for this application. Attached is a copy of the cancelled check showing a process date of 11/27/02. I also faxed in the extension with a cover letter (attached) on 11/21/02 to make sure you received it.
2. I mailed in my response to your office action in a separate package. I put in over 80 hours of work writing a 28 page response to your action, reorganizing the patent, revising the claims, and revising the drawings.
3. This patent is NOT ABANDONED and I have no intention of abandoning it. It is a very important patent for our small business. It is extremely frustrating that your offices get an unlimited amount of time to sit on my patents, respond to my patents, I have to call and beg and cajole examiners to work on my patents, I have to spend extra time and money to file expediting petitions, and then you try and slam the door shut on me in terms of processing and reviewing my reply.
4. The information on your website is extremely misleading in terms of the times allotted to replying to office actions, specifically there are lists of extensions for 3, 4 and 5 months which imply that this is IN ADDITION TOO the 3 free months we get to respond to your action. This is misrepresentation on the part of the PTO. There is no reason why this process has to be so complicated that an inventor can't process a patent application. I am smart enough to come up with the novel inventions but not smart enough to process the patent? It seems like nothing but a big money shake down for patent attorneys and you seem to always be biased in favor of working with attorneys and not pro se applicants. This is wrong, unethical and probably illegal.

Page 2

5. It seems unfair to put the burden of proof on the inventor to prove in each instance that we mailed and faxed things to you on time. Your mail and paper systems seem to be very poor and I have had numerous instances where the patent office has lost documents. I see no reason why every document I mail you should have to be sent register mail. There is no requirement under patent law to do so and it seems that such steps are an indication of the shortcomings of you paper handling processes.

I respectfully request that you accept my extension filing and respond to my response that was mailed to you. With all due respect I have no idea where the package is in your paper mill and it is not my responsibility to find it for you.

Sincerely,



William Reeves, GM, inventor

FAX RECEIVED

JAN 24 2003

GROUP 3600

OFFICIAL



Med-**DATA** Net™ LLC

PO Box 23 ~ North Branford CT 06471
Telephone 203 / 288-1588 ~ Fax 203 / 288-1589 ~ Email info@meddatanet.com

FAXED
11/20/02

Commissioner of Patents & Trademarks
Technology Center
Art Unit 3628
Washington, DC. 20231

Attention: Examiner Alexander Kallnowski

RE: First Office Action Response- Petition for Extension of Time 09/583,336

Inventor: William Reeves

Filing Date: 5/31/2000

Dear Mr. Kalinowski,

11/20/02

Attached please find a copy of my Petition for Extension of Time regarding my reply to your first office action of 09/583,336 application. I wanted to make sure I hit the two month date for an extension in getting you a reply.

I have mailed a package to you which includes a detailed response to all your objections to my Art in the application. I have reorganized the patent body and separated the abstract as you requested, and I have also provided a copy of a revised set of claims for this patent which further clarifies my art and aids in differentiating it from inferior and significantly different prior art which has been cited.

You should be receiving the package shortly by US mail. I look forward to answering any questions you may have or aiding you in any way to understand my art. I would also like to point out that this application is related to patent 6,467, 690 which has recently issued (copy attached) and to applications 09/578,884 and 09/597,107 which are pending. When I originally wrote these four patent I had envisioned an overall novel new "system" which would be comprised of novel new components. As it turned out it was much more practical and simple to break them into four separate patents.

If you need to reach me the best way is at my office 203-288-1588 or via bill@meddatanet.com.

Sincerely,

Will

William Reeves, Inventor

09/578,664

(12) **United States Patent**
Reeves

(10) Patent No.: **US 6,467,690 B1**
(45) Date of Patent: **Oct. 22, 2002**

(54) **ELECTRONIC STORAGE MEMORY CARD OR DISK AND LASER READER/WRI-TER INTERFACE**

(75) Inventor: **William Reeves, North Branford, CT (US)**

(73) Assignee: **Med-DataNet, LLC, North Branford, CT (US)**

(*) Notice: Subject to any disclaimer, the term of this patent is extended or adjusted under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) by 0 days.

(21) Appl. No.: **09/288,437**

(22) Filed: **Apr. 8, 1999**

(51) Int. Cl. **G06K 7/00**

(52) U.S. Cl. **235/486; 235/475**

(58) Field of Search **235/486, 487, 235/492, 475, 380, 375, 383**

(56) **References Cited**

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

3,976,858 A * 8/1976 Haupt 235/380

4,692,604 A 9/1987 Billings 235/493
4,795,898 A 1/1989 Bernstein et al. 235/487
4,798,322 A 1/1989 Bernstein et al. 235/487
5,682,295 A 10/1997 Horejs, Jr. et al. 361/737
5,752,857 A 5/1998 Knighs 439/638
5,872,678 A * 2/1999 Boigenzahn et al. 360/97.01

* cited by examiner

Primary Examiner—Thien M. Le

(57) **ABSTRACT**

An electronic card which is a composite of various materials, including an optically sensitive digital storage section which is capable of being formatted and having digital binary data stored within its surface. The card is capable of being erased and having new data written and of being easily carried on a person in a wallet or purse. An optical screening reader/writer drive is capable of formatting the storage media, writing data onto the card, erasing data from the card and rewriting data onto the same card.

28 Claims, 4 Drawing Sheets

